

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION:

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 10 and 11 have been amended, and new claims 12, 13, 14 and 15 have been added. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-15 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

ENTRY OF RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116:

Applicants request entry of this Rule 116 Response and Request for Reconsideration because:

(a) it is believed that the amendments of claims 1, 10 and 11 put this application into condition for allowance;

(b) the amendments were not earlier presented because the Applicants believed in good faith that the cited prior art did not disclose the present invention as previously claimed;

(c) the amendments of claims 1, 10 and 11 should not entail any further search by the Examiner since no new features are being added or no new issues are being raised; and/or

(d) the amendments do not significantly alter the scope of the claims and place the application at least into a better form for appeal. No new features or new issues are being raised.

The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures sets forth in §714.12 that "[a]ny amendment that would place the case either in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal may be entered." (Underlining added for emphasis) Moreover, §714.13 sets forth that "[t]he Proposed Amendment should be given sufficient consideration to determine whether the claims are in condition for allowance and/or whether the issues on appeal are simplified." The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures further articulates that the reason for any non-entry should be explained expressly in the Advisory Action.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

A. In the Office Action, at pages 2-5, numbered paragraphs 4-5, claims 1-5, 7-8 and 10-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Qureshi et al. (USPN 6,456,305).

The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Independent claims 1, 10 and 11 have been amended in accordance with page 6, lines 7-11 and 15-18 of the specification.

It is respectfully submitted that Qureshi et al. (USPN 6,456,305) teaches a display system and method of controlling said system utilizing a “display window.” The display window taught by Qureshi et al. is a virtual display screen, which is significantly different from the real screen of a display unit (for example, a portable display system’s monitor) as in the applicants’ display system. If anything, the “display window” taught by Qureshi et al. is analogous to the “display memory storing a processed document data” as in the applicants’ claimed display system.

The document data taught by Qureshi et al. are HTML documents, including a set of markup elements, most elements having a start tag and an end tag. The content is a combination of text and nested markup elements. Namely, the markup elements (the tags enclosed in angle brackets) contained in the document data of Qureshi et al. only relate to positional information of text data elements. It appears that the markup elements taught by Qureshi et al. are different from the applicants’ claimed layout information, which is comprised of data element identifiers, data element positions and page format data.

According to the display system and display control method of the applicants’ claimed invention, the display memory stores a processed document data so that a document is displayed on the display unit in accordance with the processed document data. The page layout processing is carried out for the data elements of the document data such that the data elements are suitably allocated on the screen of the display unit (for example, a portable display system’s monitor) according to the display layout calculated based on the detected display specification data and the detected layout data. The layout data, integrally stored with the document data, contains the layout information comprised of data element identifiers, data element positions, and page format data. Therefore, the display system and display control

method of the applicants' claimed invention are effective in improving the document displaying capabilities and the portability even when the document is displayed on the monitor of the portable display system.

Thus, independent claims 1, 10 and 11 are submitted to be allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being patentable over Qureshi et al. (USPN 6,456,305).

Since claims 2-5 and 7-8 depend from amended claim 1, claims 2-5 and 7-8 are submitted to be allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and patentable over Qureshi et al. (USPN 6,456,305) for at least the reasons that amended claim 1 is submitted to be allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and patentable over Qureshi et al. (USPN 6,456,305).

B. In the Office Action, at pages 5-6, numbered paragraph 6, claims 6 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Qureshi et al. (USPN 6,456,305; hereafter, Querishi) in view of Iwamura et al. (USPN 6,388,684; hereafter, Iwamura).

The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Qureshi et al. fails to disclose or suggest detecting a display specification data related to the display unit, the display specification data representing specifications of the display unit, in combination with storing a processed document data, so that a document is displayed on the display unit in accordance with the processed document data, as in the applicants' claimed invention. The applicants' claimed invention controls a display layout of the display unit based on the detected display specification data and the detected layout data, so that the display layout is appropriate for the document data when being displayed on the display unit.

As noted by the Examiner, Iwamura discloses displaying a calculated target region to be enlarged and the original image on the display screen. However, Iwamura does not cure the deficiencies of Qureshi et al. mentioned above and fails to disclose or suggest the above features of the applicants' claimed invention.

Thus, for at least the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that neither Qureshi et al. nor Iwamura, together or in combination, discloses or suggests the above features of the applicants' claimed invention.

It is respectfully submitted that, as admitted by the Examiner, Quershi fails to teach a display control unit that allows an image of a data element with a calculated display size to be

overlapped over a background image of the entire document data with the original display size. Although Iwamura teaches a method for displaying an enlarged target region of an image overlapped over the original image, Iwamura specifies that a peripheral region adjoining the enlargement target is displayed between the target region and the peripheral region. This display is not the same as the display of the present invention, in which the overlapped portion is not limited to reside in a position that provides a peripheral region adjoining the enlargement target. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Iwamura and Qureshi does not teach the present invention, and that amended claim 1 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Qureshi et al. (USPN 6,456,305) in view of Iwamura et al. (USPN 6,388,684).

Thus, since claims 6 and 9 depend, directly or indirectly, from amended claim 1, claims 6 and 9 are submitted to be allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Qureshi et al. (USPN 6,456,305) in view of Iwamura et al. (USPN 6,388,684) for at least the reasons that amended claim 1 is submitted to be allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Qureshi et al. (USPN 6,456,305) in view of Iwamura et al. (USPN 6,388,684).

NEW CLAIMS

New claim 12 recites that, in the display system according to claim 1, the display control unit calculates a font size of a displayed text data by using a font size list including an optimum font size for a maximum display resolution read from the display specification data of the display unit and created based on the maximum display resolution and a document font data read from text data elements of the document data.

New claim 13 recites that, in the method according to claim 10, controlling a display layout of the display unit further includes calculating a font size of a displayed text data by using a font size list including an optimum font size for a maximum display resolution read from the display specification data of the display unit and created based on the maximum display resolution and a document font data read from text data elements of the document data.

New claim 14 recites that, in the computer readable medium of claim 11, the third program code means calculates a font size of a displayed text data by using a font size list including an optimum font size for a maximum display resolution read from the display specification data of the display unit and created based on the maximum display resolution and a document font data read from text data elements of the document data.

Nothing in the prior art teaches or suggests the subject matter of new claims 12-14, when considered together with the independent claims from which they depend, respectively. It is submitted that these new claims distinguish over the prior art.

New claim 15 recites a display system in which a document data is displayed on a monitor of a display unit, comprising: a display memory storing a processed document data so that a document is displayed on the monitor in accordance with the processed document data; a display specification detection unit detecting a display specification data related to the display unit, the display specification data representing specifications of the display unit; a layout data detection unit detecting a layout data of the document data, the layout data containing layout information, comprised of data element identifiers, data element positions and page format data and being integrally stored with the document data and representing a layout data page of data elements of the document data that are displayed on the monitor such that the data elements are allocated on the monitor according to a display layout calculated based on the detected display specification data and the detected layout data page, and layout processing is carried out for data elements of the processed document data; and a display control unit controlling the display layout of the display unit based on the detected display specification data and the detected layout data, so that the display layout is appropriate for the document data when being displayed on the monitor, improving document displaying capabilities and portability when the document is displayed on the monitor.

Nothing in the prior art teaches or suggests the subject matter of new claim 15. It is submitted that this new claim distinguishes over the prior art.

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot, and further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited. At a minimum, this Amendment should be entered at least for purposes of Appeal as it either clarifies and/or narrows the issues for consideration by the Board.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited and possibly concluded by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss any such remaining issues.

Serial No. 09/741,025

Docket No. 1614.1106

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: July 22, 2004 By: Darleen J. Stockley
Darleen J. Stockley
Registration No. 34,257

1201 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501